

The Republican.

No. 7. Vol. 7.] LONDON, Friday, Feb. 14, 1823. [PRICE 6d.

TO CHIEF JUSTICE ABBOTT.

SIR,

Dorchester Gaol, Feb. 8, 1823.

I ADDRESSED you at the conclusion of my own Mock Trial, in the 9th Number of the First Volume of this work, upon the illegality and hypocrisy of your conduct in denying me the means and the right to make a proper defence, and since that time, until the Mock Trial of William Tunbridge, on the 20th of the last month, you have not individually attempted to stop a defendant in making a defence before a Jury. Your Brother Best (and a worthy and well met pair of brothers you are) has been guilty of the same conduct to Mr. Davison and my Sister, and it is singular, that the very expression for which Best stopped my Sister's defence, namely, *that the common law was a common abuse*, was quietly heard by you in the case of Mrs. Wright, at trial, on the 8th of July last: and though you vainly interrupted her in many other parts of her address, you took no exception to that particular part; thus evincing that all your interruptions are not the result of a fixed and determined sense of right and wrong, but mere individual despotic caprice. But you have been again of late, thrice guilty of that which ought to place you under impeachment. You sent Mrs. Wright to Newgate in November last, because she was plainly shewing to you and your brothers, that Christianity made no part or parcel of the law of the land; because you heard arguments offered which you felt that you could not contradict or explain away, and, therefore, you stifled the inevitable conclusions, by forcibly stopping the mouth of the female defendant. You have repeated that conduct towards the same defendant on the 6th instant, and have sentenced her unheard and unanswered, to a long imprisonment and heavy fine. And you have refused to William Tunbridge the right of making a defence, and have sentenced him to a similar fine, and still longer imprisonment,

though you had not even any evidence, that the man sold the book which formed the subject of the *ex officio* information, and you knew well that the verdict of the Jury was not a deliberate and proper verdict. For this conduct, you, and your fellows, who have participated with you, ought to be three times hanged, if it was practicable, and it is upon this subject that I now address you, for the purpose of a clear exhibition of your guilty, illegal, unjust, and oppressive conduct.

William Tunbridge was charged with publishing "Palmer's Principles of Nature," and though there was no evidence to shew, that he did deliver the book, or that he took any part in the delivery (such a lack of evidence would have obtained a defendant an acquittal in any other case, and with a less corrupt Judge) he was so far confident of the defensible character of the work, that he went into Court with an important and effectual defence, resolving not to be in any manner a party to the condemnation of principles that he approved and admired. One part of the defence was to read the whole of the book to the Jury, for the purpose, not of defaming or reviling the Christian religion, but to shew that the work had not an immoral sentence in it, that the whole was of a strictly moral and philosophic character, that it contained nothing in the shape of slander or falsehood, but a fair argument in all its points, throughout. After having done this, the defendant would have introduced other writings of the same author to shew his general philosophic character, his ability and utility as a writer, and his devoted love of truth. The author would have been shewn to be a man so far virtuous, so far attached to truth, as to have relinquished the profitable profession of a Christian Priest for the unprofitable one of an Anti-Christian Lecturer and Writer.

But you interrupted him whilst reading the fourth chapter of the work, and because he persisted in his right to proceed, you asked the Jury to give a verdict before they could possibly know the real merits of the case before them. The defendant was prepared to analyze every extract from the work, and to shew that the imputations of the information were unwarranted. He was prepared to shew, that Christianity made no part of the law of the land, and that it was not possible to combine an indefinite incomprehensible word like Christianity, with law, in any sense or meaning of the term; much less possible was it to prove that the word formed a part of the Common or Unwritten Law. Mrs.

Wright's speech in November fully and fairly argues this matter. You have had a printed copy of that speech sent to you, and I defy you, or any man at the bar, or on the Bench, or even Mr. Rennell, the Cambridge Christian Advocate, to controvert the statements of that document.

The main question between us, who are prosecuted for publishing Anti-Christian works, and you the Judges, is whether Christianity be or be not a part and parcel of the law of the land. You assert that it is so; we assert that it is not. All the reasons that you offer to support your statement are nothing more than that Sir Matthew Hale said it was so 160 years ago. We, on the other hand, analyze the whole matter, prove that you and Sir Matthew Hale are all in error, and leave you in a position where you cannot reply, and where you are obliged to say, that you *will not hear any kind of argument about the Christian religion*. If the Christian religion be part and parcel of the law of the land, it is your duty to hear arguments about it, and if it be not, if it can be shewn not to be so, it is your duty, as Judges of Law, to listen and attend to that shewing, and not proceed illegally, unjustly, and erroneously, to punish people who are conscious of not offending the law by criticising the merits of the word *Christianity*, and the doctrines founded upon it.

Sir Matthew Hale can be no authority upon this matter: nor the saying of any other man: nor would it be any authority, if every Judge who had sitten in Westminster Hall had said so. Sir Matthew Hale lived at a moment when Christianity had existed throughout Europe, unquestioned for a thousand years, and no one scarce dreamt that it was questionable. He was however the first Judge before whom a man was brought for questioning the truths of the Christian Religion, and for the gratification of punishing the man, he, Sir Matthew Hale, had to make a law for the purpose, and did so make it, by saying Christianity was part and parcel of the law, when it was not, and never had so been; and Sir Matthew Hale knew nothing more about Christianity than he did about witchcraft, for when two poor women were brought before him, under an accusation of witchcraft, he received that charge too, said that witchcraft was an offence against the law, got a verdict of guilty against the women, and actually destroyed them, or murdered them, under the pretended sanction of the law. This was Sir Matthew Hale! this was the pious Judge! as Mr. Justice Bailey calls him

And pray, Mr. Chief Justice what has made you deviate from Sir Matthew Hale's opinion about witchcraft? why because, the people have become enlightened and will no longer tolerate any such judicial murders; and they are now growing so far enlightened about the other part of witchcraft, *Christianity*, that I think, both you and I shall live to see the day when you will be ashamed to repeat that *Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land*, upon the same principle as you would now be ashamed to say so much about witchcraft.

When William Tunbridge stood before the Court for judgment, and used similar expressions to the above, Mr. Justice Best called it unintelligible trash and nonsense. Whether he meant that both Christianity and witchcraft were unintelligible trash and nonsense I cannot say, but if he did, I heartily join in the assertion, and if he only meant, that the attempt to make a comparison of the two words, was unintelligible trash and nonsense, I answer, that his assertion is easier made than proved. Witchcraft had quite as respectable and good a foundation as Christianity, or any other kind of Priestcraft: both, or all, originated with a belief of spirits good and bad, and I cannot perceive how, or upon what ground any person can reject the one craft and hold to the other; particularly, as the Bible is the foundation of both, and in fact, witchcraft has more of scriptural authority than Christianity, and is much more solid and venerable on the score of antiquity and usage.

But, Mr. Chief Justice, the matter is come to this: you are placed in a dilemma: you know not how to act, or not to act in this matter, and if you are wise you will get the Parliament to define your authority, or prevent any further prosecutions of this kind. I have something like an authority for believing that you tried, by a correspondence with Castlereagh, to prevent my prosecutions being proceeded with in 1819, and I dare say that you now wish Castlereagh had cut his throat 3 or 4 years earlier, so that he might not have opposed your influence. It is an utter impossibility that you should believe the truth of any thing called Christianity. You are known to possess too much knowledge for any such belief, and your situation on the Bench in cases of prosecutions for its support must be extremely painful or extremely hypocritical.

I shall continue to assert and to prove that Christianity has no foundation in truth: I shall never want men who will publish those assertions and proofs at all risks and penalties;

and thus you may see that a time must come when those prosecutions must cease. We are carrying our point upon the same principle as every kind of Dissenters from the Mother Church have carried theirs, and it is the nature of things that we shall be equally and as speedily successful. I publicly state to you, that there is not a man living, priest or laymen, who can defend Christianity or any other kind of religion, either as to its truth or utility, in my presence, or against my attacks.

You know the thing is a state craft and nothing more; and that it is kept up for no other purpose than for the taxation and consequent influence it gives the corrupt government of which you are a member. There may be fanatics among ignorant people; but where there is knowledge there may be hypocrisy, but there can be no religion.

R. CARLILE.

ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

A Discourse delivered before the Edinburgh Freethinker's Zetetic Society.

THE belief that the soul of man, after the dissolution of the body, is to exist for ever, has long been a popular opinion; it is a belief, that the vanity of mankind was capable of suggesting; and it is well calculated to flatter the parent that gave it birth. If life is a pleasure, it is quite natural to suppose, that man would wish to protract that pleasure; which idea would soon lead him to the hope and belief of immortality. Indeed, it would have been strange; if man, loving life, and knowing it to come to a melancholy end in a few short years, had not regretted the want of immortality. Consequently, the strong desire to protract that life would easily make him believe that he would exist for ever in another happy state, after the disorganization, and dissolution of his body. Hope helps man to surmount the difficulties of life; but it is no pledge of immortality.

Man by nature, is both a social, and a selfish animal, and it corresponds with these qualities to believe that he will exist for ever, in society with a superior kind of beings. When once that belief was adopted, it would, of course, become disagreeable to think that the body, which was so necessary an appendage to the soul, should be left to moulder in the earth. The next piece of vanity and flattery that was suggested, was the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; an opinion so absurd, so contradictory to reason, and so incompatible with all the established laws of nature, that it would be ridiculous to spend time in endeavouring to refute it, for certainly no

man endowed with common judgment, and who makes observations on the operations of nature, and also takes the trouble to reflect, can for a moment believe, that the body of a man once laid in the earth, rotten, decomposed, and passed into a thousand different forms: perhaps into the substance of plants, and other animals, with an endless variety of changes, impossible to enumerate, shall one day rise in full stature, complete, and free from all its former blemishes; to be reunited to the imaginary being, which it is said to have possessed, perhaps many centuries before.

As the eternal existence of the supposed being called *soul*, is considered to be the grand argument, I shall confine my observations at present, to that subject. I know that the unpopular opinions which I endeavour to support by this discourse; stand as it were alone, in the mighty stream of public opinion, but at the same time, if they are founded in truth, they will remain as a rock, which no current can remove. The waters may dash against it, but they will only recoil back upon themselves, and work off in froth.

I look upon it to be the duty of every man, to investigate for himself, and after mature deliberation, to form his opinion independent of the clergy, and their pretended revelations from the Deity; but I do acknowledge, that the prejudices of early education are not always easily overcome, because they are as it were, entwined with our very existence by the nurse, and afterwards stamped upon our memories by the iron seal of the priest. But if we are determined to use our own reason, and deduce arguments from the immutable laws of nature, we shall very soon be able to shake off the early prejudices, which have so long bewildered us.

It would give me as much pleasure as any other human being, to be certain of an eternal existence; but from reason, and the appearance of nature, I cannot find sufficient, or even any thing like a proof; therefore I have brought forward a few reasons that have occurred to me, against such a conclusion; that I may be corrected by the members of the society, if they consider me wrong. It is very easy for a man, or a set of men, to make any assertion; but it is a very different thing to prove that assertion; and as I think there have been no reasonable proofs, as yet, brought forward to support the opinion of an existence of the same body and life after death, I must still remain one of those, who are not disposed to believe such unnatural things upon mere assertion; and I shall endeavour to give some of the reasons for my unbelief, in as plain and concise a manner as I can; but still, I wish it to be understood, that I am not dogmatical, but open to conviction by fair reasoning.

When we behold a pale and lifeless corpse lying before us, from which the vital spark has just fled; we see no motion in the limbs, no bloom in the cheek, no lustre in the eye, no animation in the muscles. The nostrils are contracted, the mouth open, and the whole appearance of the body completely changed; which, but a little time before, was animated, cheerful, and capable of observation and reasoning. The question will then, naturally occur to

us; whether the principle which lately animated that body, but which is now fled, was a distant being, or only the result of the combination of the material particles, of which it was composed. After serious reflection, it seems evident to *me*, that mind, or consciousness, is nothing more than the result of particles of matter, arranged, or organized in a particular manner; and when differently arranged, have different results. A man then, is nothing more than a combination of material particles, so arranged, that external objects, or the results of these objects, when presented to his organs, produce sensations, and these sensations produce thought, and thought produces reflection and comparison. By reflection and comparison, he will reason well or ill, in proportion to the arrangement of his nerves, and the composition and structure of his brain and nervous system. We have reason to believe, that if the same particles which compose a horse, were arranged exactly in the same manner as those which compose a man; they would constitute a man.

The believers in immortality say, because that man is composed of innumerable small particles of matter, which are each distinct from the other, that he would not be a thinking or conscious being, without possessing some principle different from matter, and that principle they will have to be a unit, or one indivisible and immaterial something. They also say, that mind feels, remembers, compares, and desires; but do not other animals feel, remember, compare, and desire also? I should like to have it explained, how a being not composed of matter, can be endowed with these qualifications? A being that feels, remembers, compares, and desires; must be a being on which matter can make impressions, to cause these sensations, and reflections; and I think it is obvious that matter can make no impressions, except upon material substances.

There is an argument, used by those who believe, that the soul is an immaterial and distinct being from the body, but which, I think, is very far from being conclusive, that because the operations of the mind; such as hope, belief, doubt, fear, and the like cannot be divided into halves, quarters, and parts; nor be conceived as having figure and tranquillity, like all other material substances; that the mind, from which they proceed, cannot be divided, and is therefore immaterial. With the same degree of reasoning, may not these spiritualists say, that because the operations of the minds of other animals cannot be divided, they must therefore proceed from immaterial principles, quite distinct from the bodies, which inclose them? But I think it appears plain, that these thoughts or operations, are nothing else but the various results of the different combinations of matter, in animated beings. Can any man believe, that there would be such a principle as intelligence, or instinct, if there had never been such beings as animals in the universe? Banish from this room every animated being in it; and then all intelligence is gone. Banish all animals from the face of the earth, then there will remain neither mind nor instinct. If all the animated beings in the immense universe were dissolved, then there would be neither mind, nor any

of its results in existence, because it can only be in the animated parts of the universe, that the principle of mind can exist, and as soon as animals are disorganized, the intelligent part of each is gone. Now, since it is plain, that nearly the same operations, or thoughts, which are performed in the mind of man, are performed to a certain extent, in the minds of other animals, which even the spiritualists themselves allow to be the result of certain combinations of matter, their grand arguments, as to the indivisibility and immortality of the mind of man, must fall to the ground, or else the indivisibility and immortality of the minds of the lower animals must be established; because we must be convinced that they are equally indivisible; and as all experience proves that the operations of the mind of man depend entirely on the affection of his nerves and senses by exterior objects, and as the nerves and senses of other animals are also affected by exterior objects or the results of these objects, in a similar manner; we have every reason to believe that immortality may be the lot of the one, as well as of the other. But it must be granted, that the lower animals have not a power equal to man, of reflecting upon the sensations that are transmitted to their minds; but they receive their ideas exactly in the same manner and reflect like man, from observation and experience, to the full extent of their capabilities that nature has bestowed upon them, and which are always in proportion to their wants, and the rank they hold in the scale of animated beings.

However logicians may strain their imaginations, to form new names for ideas, I am convinced that there are but two kinds namely, sensitive, and reflected. Sensitive ideas are derived immediately from our senses; and these when turned over in the mind produce reflected ideas. Now, as we know, that the lower animals as well as man, are gifted with these ideas, in such proportions as suit their respective situations, we may reasonably conclude, that they have as good a claim to immortality as man.

The following argument is considered by spiritualists, as of great weight: because, say they, the particles that compose the human body, though separated by death, are not subject to annihilation, it cannot be supposed that the mind, the far noblest part, can be annihilated. But the same reasoning may be applied to other animals; as it must be allowed, that the particles composing their bodies cannot be annihilated any more than the particles composing the bodies of men; therefore their vivifying principles may also be considered immortal. But it appears plain to me that mind or consciousness, can no more exist, after the dissolution of the body, than heat can exist after the fire is extinguished, or vegetation after the tree is destroyed.

But even granting the assertion, that mind, or consciousness, does exist, after the dissolution of the body, still, as we are unconscious of having any former existence before our birth, by no reasonable analogy can we expect to have any knowledge of having been in this our present existence, at any future period, after the dissolution of our bodies. In which case, it is of little consequence to us, whether our

vivifying principle be immortal; or only the result of the combination of the material body, and equally mortal. And, if consciousness in our individual mind, has not existed from all eternity, we have no reason to conclude, that it will exist to all eternity.

But if mind should be something that has existed from all eternity independent of matter, it cannot therefore be annihilated; and the small portions of it, which are mixed up with our bodies, must return at our dissolution into the common mass of mind, as well as our bodies must return into the common mass of matter. But allowing this to be the case, we must then suppose that the Deity, the great principle of mind, is continually selecting small portions from the common stock, to animate every human body. Thus then, at the dissolution of our material bodies, if the small portions of mind which animated them do not return to the common stock, as our bodies return to the earth, that common stock of minds would, at last, be all occupied, in innumerable small portions, in the same manner as the earth would be detached into parts, and become evanescent, if bodies were not to die and return to it.

If because the mind of man is capricious, and subject to infinite reflection, it is no proof of its immortality. All his reflections, result from his comparing objects with one another. His observations can only be taken from the operations of nature: his experience is acquired by these observations, and he cannot imagine, he cannot even think of any immaterial object, or form any thought beyond nature: he is as much nature's child, as any other animal in existence; and his mind, can no more be a distinct being from his body, than the operations of any piece of machinery, can be a distinct being from the machine.

The unequal distribution of happiness in this world, is often made an argument, in favour of immortality: because, say the spiritualists, virtue is not always rewarded, and vice punished in this world: there must be a future state of rewards and punishments. But that is an assertion which has never yet been proved: because, the Deity cannot reward virtue, and punish vice in this world, is that any proof that he can do it in a world to come? It may be disputed, whether virtue is not always rewarded, and vice punished, even in this world, though we are not aware of all these rewards and punishments.

But I may ask, if other animals than man, do always partake of an equal distribution of comfort and happiness when compared with one another? I think not, yet no person has had the hardihood to say, that they are immortal; and will receive rewards and punishments in a future life; though they are allowed on all hands, to be susceptible of pleasure and pain as well as the animal man.

As a proof that the mind of man, like that of all other animals, is only the result of his organization; I may mention, that it has no command over the internal economy of his body. His mind has no power over the secretion of his glands, nor the filtration of his kidneys: his heart beats, his blood flows, his stomach digests, and his

bowels perform their vermicular motion, without any interference of his mind. Can his mind, I ask, order the body to perform, or not perform, any of these essentially necessary operations? May we not conclude that, because the body performs all the necessary operations for its preservation, independent of the mind, the mind is only the result of the organization of the body. The mind of the lower animals, have in every respect, as much controul over the natural operations of their bodies, as the mind of man has over his body; therefore, their minds may with as much reason be termed, primary and distinct objects from their bodies. They are also as perfect and as happy in the rank they hold, with their instinct and low degree of reason, as man is with all his reasoning powers, and his many wants. Is it not the same, in the great scale of nature, when the wants of animals are few, and their powers of relieving them small, as when their wants are many, and their powers great? It seems evident that the wants and reasoning powers of all animated beings, from the very lowest, to man the highest, are justly proportioned in a regular and appropriate gradation. Man though endowed with reason far above all other animals, without experience, is as ignorant as they are of the effect of any natural cause, and in despite of all his reasoning powers, he is often unable to restrain himself from indulging his passions, though injurious to himself and other animals. Sometimes even the most strenuous advocates for immortality do not scruple to indulge themselves in criminal pleasures, though they profess to believe that damnation is in all likelihood to be the consequence; but the lower animals are never impelled by their instinct, or low degree of reason, to any enjoyment that is hurtful; and their love, their connection, their parental affection, and filial regard, while it lasts, which is always as long as is useful, is not to be surpassed by the refined and reasoning animal man.

// After seriously considering the opinions, that matter and mind are two distinct things; I am utterly at a loss to conceive how any man can believe it, who examines the matter. We can conceive the material universe to have been rolling on from all eternity, and to continue to do the same to all eternity, without any such thing as mind being in existence; but we cannot for a moment, conceive a universe of mind to exist without matter, therefore matter must be the substratum; which, by the various combinations, produces mind, as a result. If mind was a separate and distinct substance from matter, we should be able to conceive it existing without matter, as easily as we can conceive matter existing without mind.

// Some men have been of opinion, that dreams are a proof that the mind of man is a distinct being from the body, but I think, that the inconsistency of our imaginations in dreams, is by no means calculated to confirm that opinion; nor to do much honour to the mind when it is left unassisted by the senses of the body. It is only when the body is capable of exercising all its senses, and performing all its internal operations, that the mind is in a perfect state; but if the mind or soul, was a distinct being from the body, it would be as able

to perform all the mental operations, in a perfect manner, when the body is only in a dormant state, as the spiritualists say it will be able to do, when the body is dissolved in the earth. Our dreams have always some resemblance to things that have passed through the medium of our senses, at some time or other: indeed, it is impossible for us to dream of any thing that our senses never informed us of. A man born blind and deaf, can never dream of seeing objects; nor of hearing sounds. Thus then, we see that the soul, can form no ideas peculiar to any sense, when that sense is wanting. But it may be further observed, that the lower animals dream as well as man, therefore their dreams are as much a proof of their minds being distinct substances from their bodies, and immortal, as the dreams of man are a proof of his mind, being distinct and immortal. From what has already been observed we may safely conclude that those who would endeavour to prove by dreams, that the mind of man is a distinct being from his body, are themselves nothing but fanciful dreamers.

There can be no sound reasoning, from the appearance of nature, brought forward to support the opinion of an existence after death. The supporters of that opinion are always reduced to the necessity of asserting that the soul, or vivifying principle, of man, is a distinct being from his body. Now, I would like to ask any of the believers in immortality, to explain, at what time this subtle being called soul, enters the body? Must we suppose that the great God of nature attends every conception with a soul in his hand, ready to implant it in the newly-formed animal? Can you believe it? No, as reasonable men; then, let us banish for ever the idea. Is it not plain to us, that all animals generate in a similar manner; all, even the most gross and the most refined? And if nature can combine matter and motion, so as to feel, think, and act in the lower animals, without endowing them with an immortal soul; why not in man? Is she not always uniform in her ways?

We must either suppose that the soul of man is a being that has existed from all eternity: or that it is a production of time. If it is produced by the act of generation, (which to me seems obvious) it is of course a production of time, and therefore cannot be supposed, with any degree of reason, to exist to all eternity. Such a supposition would be absurd, because nothing can exist to eternity, but what has existed from eternity. It is only the vanity of man that makes him form such an opinion.

But, if the soul of man is a being that has existed from all eternity, which must be the case, if it is to exist for ever, why has it no knowledge nor remembrance of its last situation? Why is it so stupid in infancy, and in unexperienced man? Why is it that the soul progressively improves till it arrives at a certain degree of perfection; and then dwindles into dotage with the body? Why is the soul so incomplete in an idiot? Why is it that some men, after having an ordinary, or a superior share of judgment, are reduced to a state of insanity or madness? These few questions, with many more of the

same kind, which I might adduce, sufficiently prove, in my opinion, that man is altogether produced by the common course of generation, therefore, can have no claim to eternal existence, more than any other animal? Is it to be supposed for a moment, that because man has a superior manner of communicating the ideas peculiar to his species, that there is something immortal in his composition? Has not every other animal the power of communicating its ideas to its own species, in proportion to its rank in the chain of animated beings? And it is more than probable that the lower animals can communicate their ideas, as far as they go, to be understood to one another, equally as well as men. Do we not see, many of them act according to circumstances and form themselves into societies, lay up provisions for the winter, and govern themselves by regular laws? Do they not all take care of their offspring, as far as their care is necessary? There are even instances of their giving assistance to their old and infirm.

But the believers in immortality say, if nature had not endowed man with an immortal soul, she would not have given him a desire after immortality. If that is a natural idea, why did so many of the ancients remain ignorant of it? But if it be supposed, that the propensity to live for ever is a proof thereof; I would answer, that our other propensities will also be proofs, that we shall obtain our desires. I think it is plain, that we have many propensities that are never gratified; I shall instance a few. Do not all mankind wish to be exempt from pain? None of them are so, but many are valetudinarians from their birth, and dwindle out their whole lives in sickness? Do not all mankind wish to be rich, or comfortable in their circumstances? How many are in the most abject misery? Do not all mankind wish to have ease and affluence? How many earn a scanty pittance, with the utmost exertions of their bodies? Do not all mankind wish to have their own will? How seldom are any of them gratified in that respect. Therefore wishes, inclinations, or propensities, to live for ever, are no proofs, that it shall be so, no more than wishes for other things are proofs that we shall get what we wish for. I say it is not reasonable, it is not even common sense, to suppose, that such a paltry creature as man, who is almost an imperceptible atom of the universe, shall exist for ever. Such opinions are nothing but the fanciful reveries of poets and fanatics, who are capable of imagining any thing, and delivering it to the unthinking world for incontrovertible facts. The vanity and ambition of man prompts him to believe it; but it is not consistent with reason, to suppose that any being can exist for ever in an unalterable state, when the whole universe, from all eternity has been changing, is at this moment changing, and will for ever continue to change.

After all the enquiries that I have as yet been able to make; I must confess that I have never found any thing to convince me that any part of man can exist after the dissolution of the body. I am persuaded, that man, and all other animals, are nothing but matter compounded perhaps in all its varieties. Thus then, when we consider

man, simply as a compounded lump of solid, liquid, and gaseous matter; we must be convinced, that any accident, or disease, which effects the more solid parts of the body, will tend to prevent them from co-operating with the liquids, and more subtile fluids; and death itself is nothing more, than the solid, and liquid parts rendered incapable by accident, disease, or decay, of admitting the gaseous matter to operate in and through the body. Thus then, when the body is so affected, that the liquids cease their motion, and the gaseous matter to operate through it, the whole frame becomes an insensible lump, liable to be immediately dissolved, and amalgamated with its parent earth. Here then, is the end of man as well as of all other animated beings.

But let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that a certain portion of man will exist for ever, after the disorganization of the body, even that supposition will bring the immaterialist into a very strange dilemma, because, that portion which they call soul, after being separated from the body, must be divested of organs to communicate sensations; and if the body is to be reunited to the soul at some future period, to furnish it with organs, how is the soul situated, or how is it occupied without organs, until that happy, or unhappy union takes place? These bodies, after being united to the souls, must still be, of the masculine and feminine gender as before, because, we well know from experience, that all animated beings, are either of the masculine or feminine gender; some few indeed are said to unite both genders in one animal, but none exists so far as we know, that do not come under the above description. Now, as long as animated beings, are of these different genders; they will have the feelings peculiar to each. Then will the Christians have the sensual heaven of the Turks. If, on the other hand, they are prohibited from connection, then is their happiness for ever impaired, as there need not be a greater evil allotted to animated beings, than always to be placed in the presence of an object, that they ardently desire, and to be continually prevented from enjoying it. //

Concerning hell, I need say nothing; as most of the liberal Christians themselves have given it up; being sensible that material fire and brimstone cannot burn spiritual soul, and as neither of these eternal places of abode for the immortal souls of men, can be pointed out by the Christian astronomers, we may reasonably conclude, that they only exist in the heads of enthusiasts and fanatics.

I am now of opinion, that the belief in immortality is hurtful to man in general, because it gives a handle to designing men, to divert the attention of mankind from the good things of this world, to the visionary objects of another, which they pretend to have discovered. But these very designing men, always take care to appropriate to themselves the blessings which they affect so much to despise. Therefore, I would advise every man to enjoy all the comforts, and all the rational and innocent pleasures which he can conveniently obtain without injuring his neighbour or himself, but at the same

time, always take care, to lay up a little store, against the infirmities of old age. It is certainly commendable to taste of the pleasures of life, as we walk through it, as we run every risk of momentary dropping into oblivion, like all other animals.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

ESTEEMED CITIZEN, Deptford, Feb. 2, 1823, Christian Era.
 IT is with pleasure I once more transmit to you the mites of a few friends of Deptford to support that cause of which you stand so pre-eminently one of its champions. A cause glorious in its origin, from its being implanted in the nature of things from all eternity:—a cause, glorious in its progress, from its not being to be resisted, and in dispensing happiness in proportion to its advances:—a cause, glorious in its consummation, being the perfection of human intelligence and happiness. This warmth of expression I could indulge in much, when I think of you, and the enjoyment of a mind free from trammels, either religious or political. But, Sir, such is not the case with the bulk of mankind. Dark are the fogs that obscure the intellectual world. Few dare to think freely, yet the Sun of Reason has arisen, with healing in his rays. Already has he broken the mist of Superstition, the fundamental prop of all tyranny. Many a spot now enjoys a pure light, which ere long may approach so as to become but one and universal. I can look back to the time, even since your trial, when my mind was not divested of religious fears, and say, from my heart, my peace was wavering, and my virtue unstable: and I appeal to the observation of any discerning mind to say, whether if every one under the power of religion, or who has not had the resolution to think and act up to the standard nature points out for our conduct, is not in the like condition. I am highly pleased when I think of your being a man of sufficient mental energy for the practice of every moral duty, thereby realizing that beautiful expression of Pope:—

“O Virtue! happiness is all thy own.”

I often think it would be well if the *Illustration of the Law of Nature*, written by Volney, could be somewhat more enlarged upon, and put on contrast with the dogmas of Christianity. If it had a wide circulation, it would be calculated to make many a one think, who now sees no beauties in nature. I know such to be the state of the mind nurtured in superstition, that all nature seems a problem of inextricable mystery, as to the object and relation of man in society. But, Sir, to return to yourself: we are all glad to see you bear your crosses with equanimity, both of misrepresentation and persecution. Not doubting the day will arrive, when you will re-

ceive an ample satisfaction, although at present there seems not enough with will and power sufficient to extricate you from your thralldom. We wish you, your Wife, and Family all possible happiness, in behalf of all here,

Yours, in the bond of Friendship,

J. HENDERSON.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
John Henderson	6	0	Belfast Boot-maker	2	0
Charles Grimwood	6	0	Maurice Troy	3	0
John Smith	6	0	Moses Philips	2	0
W. T.	5	0	Thomas Terry	1	6
J. Wood	2	0	P. H.	1	0
J. Hodges	2	0	William Allen	3	0

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

CITIZEN,

Bethnall Green, Jan. 26, 1823.

As you are in want of all the subscription-money in order to regain part of your property that was wrongfully taken from you, we, the subscribers of Bethnall Green, take the opportunity of sending you Two Pounds Five Shillings and Sixpence, being their fourth subscription. We much approve of your conduct and your principles, and hope, before long, you and your family will be released from the hands of corrupt oppressors. We shall be glad to see you once more in London, and shall continue to exert ourselves in collecting what we can for you, and in converting as many bigots in religion as possible to the true sense of it. We wish you, your Wife, and your Sister, &c. all to enjoy good health and spirits, under all the punishment your oppressors can give you.

And remain yours, truly, &c.

JAMES HOVEY.

GLORGE BASNETT.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Driglington, January 17, 1823.

THE sacrifice of your personal interest in defence of your principles, is highly meritorious; not only as a pledge of your sincerity, but more especially as a stand made in the public cause. For that nation is certainly an enslaved nation where the right of private judgment is denied; and he who withstands persecution in vindication of his own sentiments, defends the natural and inherent right

of all his fellow-citizens, merits their thanks, and the distinction of being considered the Champion of Public Liberty.

It appears to me a great misfortune that the principles of government, religious, as well as civil, are not left open to discussion, and the body politic so arranged as to admit of improvement and reformation without any risk of convulsion. The experience of all ages, however, seem not only to negative but to teach a quite different doctrine. If we look into the history of the world, and observe the process through which the various systems of its governments have passed, we behold their movements, without exception, retrograde from the point of perfection. To what are we to attribute this crab-fish like motion in the steps of that science whose progress in improvement, perhaps of all others, is the most important to mankind? Surely, in a great measure, to those unphilosophical views, which thirst after riches and power, and which seek the aggrandizement of the individual, at the people's expense.

Did our present rulers possess the super-excellence of Timoleon of ancient story; or of that hero and statesman of the western continent, whose setting glories still spread a twilight around the dark horizon of modern politics, the renovation of states and empires would be on the eve of completion, and the rational liberty of the whole world, speedily accomplished. The high and mighty powers who sway the nations, appear, however, to have their minds bent upon achievements of a very opposite nature. To subdue the light, and fetter that spirit of freedom which have escaped through the breaches in the rampire of despotism, made by the late revolution, are the objects that have concentrated all their energies, against which their whole force is evidently about to be directed.

Prepare yourself then, honest Carlile, to meet that fate which awaits you in case of defeat! Champion of the right of Free Inquiry stand firm when the hour of danger approaches! That hour which will cover you with honour as the hero of liberty; or consign you to immortal infamy in the pages of those annals which shall be written under the influence of your all-powerful foes, which annals, if I live to peruse I shall not at all be surprised to find you represented as the most impious of mankind; or even metamorphosed into that horrible monster of superstition, ycleped the great adversary of man.

BENJAMIN MOORHOUSE.

N. B. I am instructed to request that the small sum which a few friends have contributed, and which I now inclose for your use, may be considered solely as a tribute of respect and admiration; also to inform you that the obligations under which we feel ourselves placed by the generous efforts you have made in defence of public liberty, cannot be obliterated by any pecuniary aid of ours. That must stand as a monument of your love to the cause of justice and your country—as a sacrifice not to be exchanged for any earthly interest.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
An Enemy to Persecution	3	0	A Deist	1	6
A Friend to Free Enquiry	2	0	A Friend to Free Enquiry	1	0
A Republican	1	0	Robert Webster, a Priest-		
A Sceptic	1	0	hater	1	6
Richard Hepworth	1	6	Benjamin Moorhouse	2	0
Nancy Moorhouse	0	6	John Smithson, Leeds	1	0
Benjamin Rhodes	0	6			

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

DEAR SIR,

Hull, January 30, 1823.

YESTERDAY Evening we met at a public-house to celebrate the birth-day of that best of all political writers, Thomas Paine. In a few years it will probably be the boast of Englishman that their country produced such a man, who, without hyperbole, may be denominated "The Political Saviour of the World." "The Envy and Admiration of the World," has long been the jest and scorn of foreigners, and is now becoming equally contemptible at home.

Who are the "base degraded crew" at present? The Reformers or their opponents? Let George Canning answer those questions, if he knows how.

I have received the following further Subscriptions on your behalf, viz.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Joseph Jefferson	5	0	William Stephens	1	6
William Jones	5	0	John Perkins	2	0
John Kirby	2	0	James Lobley	2	0
F. C.	2	0	William Emmitt	1	0
Thomas York	1	6	Joseph Williams	2	0

The Subscribers wish very much that the total fund may not get into the hands of robbers.

The following are for Mrs. Wright whose noble intrepidity is justly admired.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
J. Jackson	5	0	John Perkins, a Republican	1	0
William Jones	1	0	J. Kirby, a Materialist	1	0
William Stephens	1	0	"Jeffries and Scroggs"	6	0
Joseph Jefferson	1	0	A Friend, E. F. C.	1	0

Yours, sincerely,

J. JACKSON.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Norwich, January 31, 1823.

THE Republicans of Norwich met on Wednesday night to celebrate the natal day of Thomas Paine, about fifty in number, the severity of the season, the stagnation of trade, together with the tyrannical dispositions of the Master Weavers to lower wages, had deprived numbers of the means of attending and consequently of subscribing, we beg your acceptance of the inclosed £1. collected in the room for the liquidation of your fines and losses, we wish it to be understood that the subscription so raised was in consequence of abstaining from unnecessary feasting, which have been but too much the practice with all clubs. We look upon it as unnecessary, and even criminal, had we spent a farthing in waste, while you, Sir, and your Sister remain incarcerated within the walls of a dungeon for want of money to pay your accursed fines, and for advocating the principles of the man whose birth-day we had met to celebrate. The songs and toasts being the same which you had recommended, and having appeared in "The Republican," therefore we think it unnecessary to occupy your valuable pages with them. Greater unanimity never reigned in any company, not an angry word, not a dissentient voice; all as one, and parted with an understanding of meeting again next year, when proper arrangements will be made, to keep up the spirit of the thing. Meetings will be held at my house on Tuesdays and Sunday evenings, where the newspaper will be read, which will furnish matter for discussion.

Wishing you, your Wife, and Sister, health and happiness, and a triumph over your enemies (the enemies of mankind) I remain, on behalf of the Subscribers.

Yours, sincerely,

EDWARD NOBBS.

P. S. I have this moment received a few lines which were spoken on the above night by a man deaf and blind, he has subscribed to the two last subscriptions under the following:

From one who can't see many things,
But can feel the fraud of Priests and Kings.

and he begs you will insert them in "The Republican."

ODE TO MAN.

BY ONE DEAF AND BLIND.

WHEN Man's ideas to Nature's works extend,
Finding changes to which there is no end;
But her, he sees, no being has controul,
And cries, O Man! what part, calls thou, thy soul?

'Tis not in body, though a breathing being,
 'Tis not in mind, though from body fleeing;
 From whence, then, can this foolish phantom spring,
 How comes, where dwells, which way does it wing?

Those principles too, which are call'd good and evil,
 In other words, named god and devil,
 Whence come they?—and where their heaven and hell?
 Look carefully, and you'll find no Man can tell!

Brave Man, victim to superstition fell,
 Be energetic, and this craft expel,
 Know, that no priest, nor king, is thy superior,
 Nor god, nor devil lives, to thee and thy exterior.

Brave man, be wise, thy idol worships quit,
 Seek knowledge sound, from Reason's stores get wit;
 Obey such laws, as equal rights protect,
 And happy be, in mind free and correct.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

RESPECTED SIR,

Huddersfield, Feb. 2, 1823.

I AM happy to have the pleasure of again forwarding you a small sum being the amount of a third subscription by a few friends to Liberty, in Huddersfield and its neighbourhood, amounting to £8. 12s. 2d. towards enabling you to stem the tide of oppression, which your persecutors have so liberally heaped upon you, with a hope, no doubt, of being able to crush your exertions for the emancipation of mankind from that most odious of curses—Priestcraft.

I am happy to inform you that the cause for which you have so long struggled is rapidly gaining ground, though it has had to contend with every obstacle that malice or bigotry could invent, without in the least impairing its lustre, for the more it is examined, the brighter appears its truth. I am one, Sir, that is averse to flattery, but must say that in my opinion you have deserved well of your country, and am surprised that the enlightened part of the community have not come more boldly forward to your support. Liverpool, for instance (amongst many others) has surprised me in the smallness of its subscription for a town of that extent, which if this is compared with it, will only appear as a village, and which if I am correct has sent three times the amount.

In addition to the above, you will find there is six shillings for Mrs. S. Wright which you will have the goodness to forward to her. Give my kind respects to your Wife and Sister, accept the same yourself, and hoping soon to hear of your liberation,

I remain, Sir, yours respectfully,

A. HELLAWELL.

P. S. A few friends met at Huddersfield to commemorate the birth-day of the Immortal Paine; when, after your health had been given, it was proposed that a small tribute of respect should be collected to evince the sincerity of our wishes, and £1. 6s. was instantly subscribed.

Third Subscription from Huddersfield.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Abel Hellawell	5	0	N. J.	0	6
J. T., an Enemy to Kingcraft, Priestcraft, and Patronage	1	0	G. A.	1	0
R. Brook, a Republican and Materialist	5	0	A Friend to Truth	1	0
M., an Enemy to Tyranny and Oppression	0	6	James Clough	2	0
Richard Hayes	0	6	Charles Ives	1	0
Joseph Bradley	0	6	William Wilson, Cordwainer	1	0
James Butterworth	1	0	One who dislikes Religious Persecution	5	0
A Friend to Humanity	1	0	John Shaw	1	0
Joseph Gledhill	1	0	James Mills	1	0
William Hawkyard	1	0	Micah Wright, a Materialist	2	0
Joseph Smith	1	0	William Hirst	2	6
Eli Hirst	1	0	L. Shaw	0	3
William Brook	2	0	B. Ormerod	2	0
John Carr	1	0	An Enemy to Priestcraft under any disguise	5	0
James Sykes	1	0	George Whitam	0	4
James Read	1	0	Joseph Stanley	1	0
Joseph Hirst	1	0	John Bradley	0	6
Joseph Binus	1	0	James Brown	0	6
John Tetley	1	0	Thomas Bagshaw	1	0
Received through the hands of John Dennis Rhodes, the Subscription of a few Friends	20	0	Samuel Horbury	0	6
William Brookes	1	0	Ben Stanley	1	0
Thomas Shepherd, if "thine enemy hunger give him meat"	3	0	William Cottrill	1	0
John Dennis Rhodes	1	0	A Friend to Carlile	1	0
Joseph Bray	0	3	An Enemy to Priestcraft	1	0
William Dunkerley	3	0	Joseph Holt	1	0
Matthew Vickerman	1	0	Dr. Sangrado	2	0
J. T., four years I have been a Methodist, two years a Radical, but now I am a Materialist and Republican	1	0	Miss Brook, who is determined to go to Heaven without money and without price	1	0
T. G., a Friend to Reason	1	0	A Deist and Republican	1	0
James Hirst	1	0	An Enemy to all Priests and not afraid of Devils, J. S.	2	6
Old Joe has seen into the Priest system a long time	0	6	One who thinks the Lord Chief Justice should have exchanged places with the Defendant, Tunbridge, for his illiberal Jefferies-like conduct during the course of his Mock Trial	5	0
			G. Wilkinson, one that is beginning to be ashamed		

	s.	d.		s.	d.
in believing the tale about			John Pawson	1	0
an Holy Omnipotent Spirit			William Halley	0	6
coming down from Heaven			Thomas Hamerton	1	0
to make a cuckold of poor			Thomas Bently	0	6
Joseph	1	0	John Stead	1	0
Collected on Mr. Paine's			James Scott, who hopes soon		
Birth day	26	0	to see the day when that		
<i>Second Subscription from Rastrick</i>			hateful and tyrannical term		
<i>of a few Friends to Liberty, who</i>			toleration shall be for ever		
<i>wish to identify themselves with</i>			banished from the English		
<i>Mr. Carlile, and the Cause he so</i>			vocabulary, and the phrase		
<i>ably advocates.</i>			Universal, Civil, and Reli-		
Abraham Walker	2	6	gious Liberty, in its fullest		
An Enemy to Kingcraft and			acceptation, be substituted		
Priestcraft	1	6	in its place	1	0
Joseph Johnson, a Friend to			Benjamin Noble	1	0
Free Discussion	1	0	James Sykes	1	0
William Walker	2	6	Joseph Shepley	1	0
G. Cooper, Rushfirth	0	6	F. Thornton	1	0
A Detester of Kings and			D. T.	2	0
Priests	0	6	Thomas Burgess, a disbe-		
James Thornton	1	0	liever in ghosts, (whether		
William Thornton	1	0	holy or not) devils, hob-		
May Truth be always re-			goblins, &c. But thinks		
spected, and Honesty ne-			that if one or two of the		
ver neglected, Samuel			ancient gentry could be		
Thornton	2	6	snugly seated in a caravan		
Jonas Hellowell	1	6	it might be a very lucrative		
John Booth	1	0	concern to a certain set of		
Henry Collingwood	1	0	Slugs	1	0
A Friend to the Liberty of			John Parkin	0	6
the Press	1	0	Robert Goodhall	0	6
A Friend	1	0	Richard Marsden, a poor,		
Barnard Brook	1	0	but sincere, Republican	0	1
Thomas Morton	0	6	Joseph Fallows	1	0
A Friend	0	3	<i>To the brave and patriotic female, Mrs.</i>		
Charles Collin	0	6	<i>S. Wright, as a token of respect for</i>		
James Tasker	0	6	<i>the noble manner in which she</i>		
William Bastow	0	6	<i>braved the threats of the Judge, and</i>		
Thomas Thornton	0	6	<i>boldly advocated the cause of Free</i>		
Elijah Noble	1	0	<i>Discussion.</i>		
Samuel Mitchell	0	6	Abraham Walker	2	6
Thomas Thornton	1	0	William Walker	2	6
John Pearson	1	0	Samuel Thornton	1	0

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

Salford, Manchester, January 30, the 1823d year of the generally supposed founder of the Christian Religion, whom the pretended Vice Suppressors of that day (the Priests) sentenced to death for blasphemy, and calling their reverences, hypocrites and whitened sepulchres.

MUCH ESTEEMED FELLOW CITIZEN,

"THE Philistines are upon thee" Carlile! for which reason, the members of the Salford Zetetic Society have transmitted to you its second subscription, which, though but trifling in amount, may assist a little towards enabling you to meet the "destroyers" and not the "sellers" of your property, as they have prevented you from giving it timely notice in a public manner, and having kept back, at their own caprice, such works as they, in their hypocritical godly zeal, choose to term libellous. This is another instance of their Christian-like justice and loving their enemies! But we hope we shall soon see the time when the much dreaded reign of Anti-Christ shall totally abolish Idolatry and human misery, arising from the baneful systems of Kingcraft and Priestcraft. We shall then hear no more of, "you have nothing to do with the taxes, but to pay them," nor of that hypocritical cant from the Priest, that "poverty is good for the soul" and "take no thought for to-morrow, what ye shall eat, and what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed," whilst these followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, these props of religion, these pillars of the Church, these lambs of the Lord are preying upon the vitals of the people, by wallowing in the greatest luxury. Often have I, whilst in the Methodist society, seen and heard an hypocritical class leader, tell a poor miserable half-starved creature, when collecting his weekly pennies from the poor deluded wretches, that he should remember the "widow's mite," making the widow's condition an argument for extorting the poor creatures weekly penny. Likewise, when he goes to receive his quarterly ticket from the hands of one of his Priests, which admits him into the love-feasts, covenant-meetings, or any private meetings, you will not hear him say then, that "the Gospel is without money and without price." As a proof of their cowardly and mean submission to superstitious tyranny, they are not allowed to enter their pews in the chapel, when a sermon is to be preached for the benefit of those seminaries for hypocrisy and superstition, Sunday Schools, unless they comply with the notice, that "silver at least, will be expected at the doors." They may with as much justice stand sentry at their residences, and demand silver before they allow them to enter their houses, as to presume to stop a man from entering the seat that he rents.

You will oblige me very much, Sir, if you would give me your ideas and reasons for the celebration of the birth-days of public characters, preserving and almost idolizing portraits, statues and relics, &c. As I at present, look upon a many of those things as a species of idolatry. The anniversary of American Independence, or of the Spanish Revolution, are, under present circumstances, worthy of commemoration, and indeed, as long as such glorious events shall remain on record; but I am sorry to see the celebration of birth-days, and public dinners prove very injurious to those whose failing it may be, to yield too much to the enchantments of Bacchus.

We congratulate you, and Mrs. Carlile on the near approach of her liberation, and may you live long, and always steady and true to your principles. This is the sincere wish of a great admirer of your honest conduct.

JOSEPH LAWTON.

P. S. The Salford Zetetic Society is removed from the house of George Longbottom, Borrow Street, to the house of John Faulks, Queen Street, Salford.

	s. d.		s. d.
Thomas Wood	1 0	of One Shilling as long as	
Joseph Lawton, an advocate		their remains an instance	
for Free Discussion	4 0	in his country of fine or	
Grace Lawton	1 0	imprisonment for Free Dis-	
John Preston, an Enemy to		cussion	2 0
all liars and persecutors,		William Spencer, from Queen	
even if it is Mr. Carlile		Street, Deansgate	0 6
himself	1 0	A Friend	0 6
J. Tracey	1 0	Thomas Derbyshire, a Friend	
George Longbottom	1 0	to Mr. Hunt, and an	
Abigail Longbottom	1 0	Enemy to Oppression	1 0
William Smith	1 0	John Foulkes	1 0
J. Collins	1 0	Mrs. Foulkes	1 0
L. Sissons	1 0	John Mitchell	0 6
Thomas Crosby	0 6	J. E.	2 6
A Widow's mite	0 6	Thomas Steal	1 6
A Friend, T., who will con-		Jos. Boyd	0 6
tribute his monthly quota			

TO MR. JOSEPH LAWTON, SALFORD, MAN-
CHESTER.

CITIZEN,

Dorchester Gaol, Feb. 8, 1823.

AFTER thanking you and my friends of the Salford Zetetic Society for your further support, I proceed to give you my opinion upon birth-day commemorations.

Taking a general view of such festivals, I tell you, without hesitation, that I despise them, particularly where it

forms a piece of adulation to a living character: but, under any and every view, I consider them *useless*, unless where they can be made *useful* in the way of strengthening and propagating good principles.

The principles of Thomas Paine are the rising principles of the age; they are opposed and scouted by all that is corrupt and venal in the country; and, against this corruption and venality, we who advocate those principles have to contend in our endeavours to propagate them, therefore, I deem it useful for the present to select the birth-day of Thomas Paine, as a festival for the commemoration, the propagation, and the public advocacy, by bodies of men and women of his principles. But drinking to intoxication is another matter; and it is much to be wished that all persons who do this would remain Christians and Slaves. Drunkenness I abominate both in man and woman. A person who makes a practice of drinking to intoxication as often as the means can be found, is a beast of no value to the community, and the sooner it destroys itself by its excesses the better. That is a wise law in the United States of America that deprives such persons of all controul over property.

The possession of portraits, statues, and relics, are matters of taste, and carry no bad effects with them; and I can only tell you on this head, that I have no taste for any thing of the kind, and that wherever I am the master of a room, the walls are found undecked with any such things. I value nothing but good principles, such as I conceive to be imperishable, in the shape of a relic or memento of any man; though, I confess, I do like to see the portrait of a good author at the head of a collection of his works. I got up a statue of Paine for my shop, and sold his bust, but it was from the motive of exciting curiosity, calling attention to his writings, and a means to accelerate the propagation of his principles; all which were effected agreeably to my expectations.

Now, if ever the principles of Thomas Paine come into practice, by superseding those now acted upon, then I should think the time had arrived to leave off celebrating his birth-day, and not until then; but even now, I should feel more pleasure in a sentimental than in a sensual celebration of that day. As an individual, I am extremely averse to going from home for the sake of eating and drinking in parties, and I never did feel any pleasure in any thing of the kind. I am of opinion, that every thing which can

come under the idea of sensual gratification should be practised as private as possible, at home, in families, and that all public meetings should be sentimental only, for mental improvement, or for the furtherance of public and general matters. This, in my humble opinion, would greatly add to the amount of social order by abating excesses of all kinds.

I am, Citizen, respectfully yours,
R. CARLILE.

CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL.

(Continued from page 192.)

CHAP. VII.

Preaching of St. Paul at Corinth and Ephesus.

AFTER leaving Athens our Apostle came to Corinth. It appears that at first he had not much success, for he took to his old trade of tent-making. However, he ventured to preach in the synagogue, where the Jews were indignant at his discourse: they carried him to the tribunal of the proconsul of Achaia, who had sufficient prudence to refuse to interfere in their contests. The Jews did not imitate his moderation; they ill-treated Sostenus, the chief of their synagogue, either for having allowed Paul to preach there, or for having been converted by his discourse.

Paul, after some days, departed from Corinth, he cut off his hair to fulfil a vow he had made, and which apparently obliged him to be present at Jerusalem, in order to sacrifice in the temple, according to the law. Whence we see that our Apostle had not yet totally abandoned the Jewish religion, and that he judged it good policy, occasionally to manœuvre with the Jews. In fact we continually see him sometimes practising, and at others decrying, Judaism.

From Jerusalem, Paul went to Antioch, where he remained some time, but the activity of his mind soon put him in motion. After having crossed the high provinces of Asia he came to Ephesus, where he found the secret of uniting to his sect the disciples of St. John the Baptist, whom he rebaptized, and made them acquainted with the Holy Ghost of whom they had no idea. Having now in-

creased his party by these new recruits, Paul set about preaching in the synagogue, but finding the Jews rather untractable, he withdrew himself, and separated his disciples from them. He then commenced teaching in a separate school and performing miracles to confirm his discourses; he cured the sick, and especially those possessed, in which he succeeded much better than those of the Jews, who endeavoured from his example to attempt such cures. These miracles converted many persons.

Nevertheless, the preaching of Paul at Ephesus gave rise to an affair, which had nearly proved very troublesome. The Goldsmiths of this city derived much profit from the manufacture of little silver shrines of Diana, the patroness of the Ephesians. These artisans were much disturbed with the preaching of our apostle, who decried the gods, and might thus occasion the ruin of their trade; their clamour alarmed the people, and caused a great commotion; the public, as is generally the case, when the affair relates to religion, grew very violent, without knowing why. They comprehended, in general terms, that their religion and its patroness were attacked; and there needed nothing more to inflame their zeal. However the town-clerk of the city having explained to them that their goddess was in no danger, succeeded in calming the fury of the superstitious populace, and thus extricated our apostle from his embarrassments.

Paul, however, thought proper to quit a city, in which he had run such a risk, and again put himself in motion. Arrived at Troas he recommenced preaching, when his sermon, being, a little too long, sent a young man to sleep, who fell from the third story into the street: they took him up for dead, when our Apostle having embraced him, assured them that he lived, the author of the Acts, takes this fact for a miracle, and tells us gravely that Paul raised a dead man on this occasion.

Notwithstanding this pretended miracle, which if it had been true ought to have converted the whole town, Paul went directly away, and recommenced his travels. At Miletus he took leave of the priests of all the adjacent places, after having made them a pathetic exhortation, in which he boasts of his humility and disinterestedness, and desires them to watch over the flock which he had gathered together by his preaching and indefatigable exertions.

CHAP. VIII.

The Apostle gets into embarrassments at Jerusalem, and is sent to Rome.

PAUL now embarked for Jerusalem; notwithstanding his own presentiments, the warnings that were given him, and the prayers of his adherents, he was obstinately determined to resort to this city, where the Jews irritated by his successes, prepared him an unpleasant reception. He was welcomed by the brethren to whom he related the progress of the new sect, but these informed him of the bad designs of the Jews, who pretended, and not without reason, that he taught a doctrine contrary to that of Moses. To silence these rumours, and to calm the anger of the populace, they advised him to fulfil some of the Jewish ceremonies in public, and to give to these acts of religion much solemnity.

Paul consented to this counsel, but the Jews of Asia, were not thus duped, they knew what to keep to respecting the doctrine which had disgusted them; they then excited the Jews of Jerusalem, by saying, that he brought the Gentiles into the Temple. All the city was soon in an uproar, the devout people seized Paul, drew him out of the Temple, the gates of which were closed against this profaner. They were going to kill him, had not a tribune rescued him out of their hands, and shut him up in a fortress, in the midst of the clamour of an enraged populace, which demanded his death.

The Apostle ready to enter his prison, asked of the tribune permission to harangue the mob, which was granted after his Conductor was probably assured that he was not the brigand who had lately excited an insurrection in the country.

In his discourse, which he pronounced in Hebrew, Paul related to the people the history of his miraculous conversion, nearly in the manner in which it has been narrated. This recital far from softening the Jews, made them lose all patience, especially when our Apostle told them he was sent to the Gentiles. They then broke silence, crying out, "away with such a fellow from the earth, it is not fit that he should live." The tribune then shut him up in prison, and commanded that he should be scourged, in order to draw from him an acknowledgment of the crime which had excited the fury of the Jews. Paul then declared himself a Roman citizen, and represented to the centurion charged with the execution of these orders, that it was contrary to

law, thus to treat a citizen without a trial. The centurion informed the tribune, who was fearful of having acted with too much precipitation. He was desirous of knowing for a certainty of what he was accused by the Jews, and the next morning, freeing him from his chains, presented him to the priests and council of the nation. Paul then began to harangue the council. He first declared that in all he had done, he had followed strictly the dictates of his conscience. At these words the High Priest gave him a box on the ear, at which Paul being irritated, instead of turning the other cheek, according to the precept of Jesus, abused the High Priest, treated him as a hypocrite, or whitened wall. But as he perceived that he had given offence by his insolence to a man respected by the Jews, he moderated himself, and alleged that he was ignorant that it was the High Priest whom he had thus addressed in such terms; an ignorance, however, which cannot fail to excite surprise, considering that he was a man, who must have been informed respecting the place where he was, and the quality of those before whom he was speaking. Our orator was more of an adept, in managing the opinions of his auditory: aware that the council was composed of Sadducees, who denied the doctrine of the resurrection; and of Pharisees, who supported it, he knew how to profit by this circumstance, by sowing the seed of discord among his judges. In order to this he pretended that he was a Pharisee, and the son of a Pharisee, and asserted that they sought his life, because of his hope in the resurrection of the dead.

This stratagem produced the desired effect, the Pharisees declared in his favour, and acknowledged his innocence, saying, "We find no evil in this man, but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to this man, let us not fight against God." The tumult increased, and the tribune fearing that the orator would be torn in pieces, put him under a guard of soldiers, and carried him back to prison.

During the following night, Paul had a vision, in which he thought he saw the Lord, who told him to be of good courage; and prophecied that he should go to Rome to bear witness. On the other hand forty fanatical Jews, made a vow neither to eat nor drink till they had assassinated Paul. This resolution had the approbation of the princes and priests, who according to the clerical spirit, found nothing more just than assassination in order to get rid of an enemy. The senators also consented to this treachery. But Paul's nephew having informed him of this

plot, he made the tribune acquainted with it, who to secure the safety of his prisoner, and to rescue him from the fury of the Jews, conducted him under a good escort to Cesarea, and put him under the protection of Felix, the governor of that province.

Paul, and his accusers, made their appearance before the pagan governor, who, little versed in the theological disputes of the Jews, told them that he should decide the affair when he was more fully acquainted with the particulars. However some days after, he caused the Apostle to be brought before himself, and his wife Drusilla, who was a Jewess; they heard what he had to say to them of faith in Jesus Christ. But when Paul, after having preached to them of justice, charity, and repentance, spoke of the last judgment, they were afraid, and ordered him to retire, postponing the hearing till a future time. Felix hoping to draw some money from his prisoner, often sent for him to converse with him. This conduct lasted two years, at the end of which period this Governor was replaced by Festus.

The Jews proceeded to accuse Paul before the new governor, and demanded that he should be sent to Jerusalem. The accused, well knowing that the place of this scene would be unfavourable to him, and fearing that Festus would yield to the importunities of his enemies, appealed from him to Cæsar. This appeal suspended all proceedings. However Festus having spoken of his prisoner to King Agrippa, who had the curiosity to see a man that had made so much noise in Judea. Paul appeared before this prince, justified himself from the accusations brought against him, and finished by preaching the resurrection of Jesus Christ. This doctrine appeared so strange to Festus that he did not doubt a moment of his being deranged. However as folly did not seem to him a crime worthy of death, he would instantly have acquitted him, had he not made an appeal to Cæsar. In consequence of this appeal, Paul was put on board a ship about to sail for Italy. After many difficulties he was shipwrecked on the coast of the isle of Malta, where the author of the Acts, from whom we have taken this narrative, does not fail to make him perform miracles, a necessary seasoning to legends.

Amongst other wonders which Paul wrought in the isle of Malta, he cured himself, in a very natural manner, of the bite of a viper; in fact, it appears that he applied fire to it immediately, a simple and well known remedy, but which was such a prodigy in the eyes of the poor Maltese, that they took him, who was in possession of so fine a

secret, for a God*. There was apparently nothing more wonderful in the Apostle curing the son of his host, whom he found ill of a fever and dysentery; disorders which we find yield to very simple remedies. Still this cure gained Paul great reputation, they soon brought him a great number of sick, who, according to our historian, he did not fail to cure. They rendered him great honours, furnished him with the necessary provisions for his voyage, and he embarked for Italy.

Upon his arrival at Rome, Paul was permitted to confer with the Christians, and to preach to the Jews whom he endeavoured to convert to the faith of Christ by the law of Moses and the prophets, which he had the talent of applying wonderfully to his views: Some smitten with the mystical, cabalistical, and allegorical explications, that our Apostle gave them, adopted his opinions, while many others resisted his arguments.

Indignant against the latter, he told them that their hardness of heart had been predicted by Isaiah; he then gave them to understand, that God had formed the project of blinding them, in order to have a fair pretext for rejecting them, and transferring to the Gentiles, the light and salvation of which the Jews had made themselves unworthy, by the obstinacy in which it was the will of God that they should persist.

This conduct of the Divinity must doubtless have appeared very strange to the Jews. So the Acts inform us, that there arose from these preachings of Paul, great contests among them. They turned apparently upon predestination and grace; questions upon which Christian theologians, have not after eighteen centuries been able to come, either to an understanding or agreement.

It appears that notwithstanding the obscurity of his doctrine our Apostle succeeded in gaining proselytes to his sect; this obscurity itself, has charms for many persons, who believe that a doctrine, is so much the more marvellous or divine, as it is above the power of the understanding. He preached during two years to the Romans, without any person throwing obstacles in his way, and thus laboured to spread this religion in the capital of the world.

The Acts of the Apostles, which the church orders us to receive as of divine inspiration, informs us nothing more. St. Luke to whom this work is generally attributed, has transmitted to us, neither the actions, miracles nor death of his heroes. We are reduced to seek our information thereupon

* Acts chap. xxviii. ver. 3—6.

from traditions, which the interests of the clergy would wish us to regard, almost as sacred as divine inspirations. According to these respectable traditions, our Apostle shed his blood for the faith in the propagation of which he had laboured; he was, say they, beheaded in the reign of Nero, and in the sixty-sixth year of the Christian era.

After what has been said, we ought naturally to regard St. Paul as the true founder of the pontifical see of Rome. Nevertheless certain traditions, useful to the Roman Pontiffs oblige us to believe that it was St. Peter, who established his throne in the capital of the world; the popes have thought, that their interests required, that they should pass for the authorized successors of this Prince of the Apostles, to whom Christ himself according to the Gospel, granted immense rights and privileges. These traditions then make St. Peter travel to Rome, prior to St. Paul, and only regard the latter as the subaltern associate in the Apostolic labours of the former.

Nevertheless some critics have ventured to doubt of the reality of St. Peter's voyage to Italy, and his foundation of the first see in the world, some authors otherwise very orthodox, without regarding the interests of the Pope, or respect for the traditions which favour them, have treated those pretensions as chimeras: as to the heretics, the sworn enemies of the authority of the Roman Pontiff, they have asserted, that the voyage of St. Peter to Rome was a fable invented by the supporters and partizans, with a design to exalt his authority. Both parties found their doubts or assertions upon these grounds. First, That the books which the church considers as inspired, make no mention of the voyage of Simon Peter, although the circumstance of going to plant the faith in the capital of the world, was sufficiently remarkable to claim a notice in preference to all the minor cities, which the Acts inform us that he visited to preach; in fact, the Holy Ghost, or St. Luke his organ, wishing to inform us in this history of the means made use of by God, to propagate the Gospel, could not without injustice, omit such a signal success, nor fail to give the honour of it to St. Peter, in case he had a claim to it.

Secondly, St. Paul who was at Rome at the same time, that Peter was supposed to have been there, never once mentions this Prince of the Apostles, in the epistles to the faithful at different places, while he speaks to them of many other disciples of much less consideration than his illustrious colleague: we ought piously to suppose that if St. Peter had really established the faith at Rome, the Apostle of the Gentiles

would have been too equitable to ravish from him the glory, that must have accrued to him from so fine a conquest.

Thirdly, Our two Apostles, after the disputes, which they had at Antioch would not have been desirous of meeting, or exhibiting in the same place. St. Peter would naturally avoid a haughty colleague, who resisted him to his face, and who publicly reprov'd him in a manner sufficiently disagreeable. Besides Rome being a pagan city, naturally fell into the department of the Apostle of the Gentiles. In short according to the Acts of the Apostles, St. Paul was too hasty to agree long with an associate greater than himself. His quarrel with Barnabas, for a slight difference, proves that Paul was easily irritated.

Fourthly, St. Peter wrote his first epistle from Babylon, and not from Rome. It is true that the advocates of this voyage of Peter's, pretend that Babylon is the same city as Rome, but this is a geographical error, that without a great share of faith can never be admitted for a truth. Again, the city of Babylon in Syria, no longer existed in the time of Peter, there was then only a Babylon in Egypt; it is only there that we can suppose Peter to have written this first epistle.

Fifthly, The traditions which make St. Peter travel to Rome, are filled with fables, which make them very suspicious, such as his dispute with Simon the magician, who having raised himself into the air, by virtue of his art, fell down and broke his limbs by virtue of the Apostles prayers. We may also place in the list of fables, the apparition of Christ to Peter, when he fled from Rome, and his crucifixion with his head downwards. These facts are related neither by inspired authors, nor eye witnesses, they are founded on traditions only, that is to say, popular rumour, which many persons do not respect so much as the Pope, and the clergy seem to desire.

At the risk then of "uncovering Peter to cover Paul" we say that all these reasons, seem at least to authorize a doubt respecting the voyage of St. Peter to Rome, at any rate the Acts of the Apostles appears to insinuate that Paul was the true founder of the see of Rome. He must then be regarded as the first Pope. Besides the popes have adopted his maxims, and faithfully imitate his policy in many respects; this would easily be proved by comparing the almost constant principles of the church of Rome, with those of our Apostle, which we shall soon have occasion to examine.

(To be Continued.)